



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit : 1742 Customer No.: 035811
Examiner : Sikyin Ip
Serial No. : 09/937,889
Filed : October 2, 2001 Docket No.: 1307-01
Inventors : Akio Tosaka
: Sinjiro Kaneko
: Yoichi Tominaga
: Noriyuki Katayama
: Nobutaka Kurosawa
: Kei Sakata
: Osamu Furukimi
Title : HIGH TENSILE HOT-ROLLED STEEL SHEET
: HAVING EXCELLENT STRAIN AGING
: HARDENING PROPERTIES AND METHOD
: FOR PRODUCING THE SAME

Dated: March 6, 2006

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

For

Postcard
Response

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to **Mail Stop AF**, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date appearing below.

Name of Applicant, Assignee, Applicant's Attorney
or Registered Representative:

DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP
Customer No. 035811

By: _____ *R* _____

Date: _____ *6 MAR 2006* _____



AF
Zhu

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit	:	1742	Customer No.: 035811
Examiner	:	Sikyin Ip	
Serial No.	:	09/937,889	
Filed	:	October 2, 2001	
Inventors	:	Akio Tosaka	Docket No.: 1307-01
	:	Sinjiro Kaneko	
	:	Yoichi Tominaga	Confirmation No.: 8803
	:	Noriyuki Katayama	
	:	Nobutaka Kurosawa	
	:	Kei Sakata	
	:	Osamu Furukimi	
Title	:	HIGH TENSILE HOT-ROLLED STEEL SHEET	
	:	HAVING EXCELLENT STRAIN AGING	
	:	HARDENING PROPERTIES AND METHOD	
	:	FOR PRODUCING THE SAME	

Dated: March 6, 2006

RESPONSE

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is submitted in response to the Official Action dated January 3, 2006. The Applicants submit the following remarks in support of withdrawal of all of the rejections and prompt allowance of all the solicited claims.

The Applicants note the rejection of Claims 1-5, 10, 12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112. The rejection takes the position that:

The instant claimed limitations N/Al ratio and N dissolved content in claims 1, 2, 10, and 12 have no literal support in the specification originally filed.

Also, the rejection states “N/Al being ‘0.3 or more’ as originally claimed could merely mean 0.31 not 0.6 as instantly claimed. Same rationale holds true for N in the dissolved state.”

The Applicants respectfully submit that the above position in the rejection does not properly state the requirements for §112 on the one hand and is inaccurate on the other hand. The Applicants will first address the claimed “N in the dissolved state being 0.0030% or more.”